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# SERVICE OF THE MILITIA. SPEECH 

OF

# HON. JAMES HARLAN, OF IOWA, 

DELIVERED

In the United States Senate, July 11, 1862.

The Senate having under consideration the bill to amend the act calling forth the militis to execnte the laws of the Unlon, to suppress insurrections, and repel tnvasions-

Mr. Harlan said: Mr. Presment, I think there can be no doubt but that the President has the power, under existing laws, to call out more troops; and he is, probably, acting in pursuance of that authority in the intimations given to the Goveruors of the States that more would be accepted. One object, I believe, in passing this bill, is to enable him to call them out for a longer period than the law now authorizes, should he deem it necessary. If this bill should become a law it will also be an intimation to the President that in the opinion of Congress a change of polieg is desirable in the particulars that have been referred to by the Senators who have spoken this morning. Nor do I think that sach an intimation by Congress ought to be or would be considered by the Pres. ident offensive or undesirable. None who uaderstand the frankuess of his nature could entertain such an opinion. If, in the opinion of Congress, any change of policy, however small or great, is deairable, I have no doubt he would be gratified with a elear, nnequivocal expression of that opinion. Heace, if the President has the power to do all that is contemplated by the proposed amandments, their adoption can do no harm, and may do goed. It divides the responsibility; and should he find it necessary to follow this intimation, he will have the support of Congress. And, on the other hand, if existing laws do not, as some suppose, confer on him this power, it is clearly granted by the provisions of this bill and peuding amendments. The people, also, have a right to know that the President's poliey is approved by their immediate representstives in the national legislature. I therefore differ in opinion with the Senator from Penasjlvanis, [Mr. Cowax,] if I understand correctly the views presented by him this morning on this point ; and still more radically in rela. tion to the relative rights of the Goverament and the people of the rebellious States. If I understood him correctly in the expression of his views on this subject a few days since, they are quite similar to if not identically the same as those entertained by Jefferson Davis, and so frequently expressed by him and his associate
conspirators on this floor during the last Congress. If I understood his speech correctly, he believes that when the people within the limits of any State, with considerable or practical unanimity, are opposed to the Gowernment of the United States, and desire to release themselves from its restraints, they have a right to dissolve the Union and to organize a new Government for themselves.

Mr. COWAN. I stated, as I remember most distinctly, that at the outset of this rebellion we had a right to take one of two courses: we had the right to assume that these States were out of the Uuion, and we could, by virtue of our power as a nation, make war upon them; could make conquest of them, and subjagate them. But I desire to say this: that what I suppose was taken to resemble secession was the fact that I asserted: proceeding as we did upon the ground that we would not make conquest and subjugation, if, at the end of that time, it was found that there were no loyal people there, I said there was an end of it, unless we fell back upon our rights anas a nation to make conquest and subjugation; and that was the whole of it. I say so still, and am prepared to stand upon it anywhere. I think it is unexceptionable.

Mr. HARLAN. I did not ase the name of the rebel chief in this connection for the purpose of forming an offensive association of uames, and had no intention of giving offence. I alluded to what appeared to me to be similarity of argument, and not similarity of character. And I suppose it possible for the rebel Davis to entertain correct opinions on the theory of government, while his conduct bas been so disastrous to the interests of the nation, and especially to his own section of the country. Abating any offensive features of the allusion, I will reiterate that the Senator, as I understood him, repeated the arguments of the rebel Senators who occupied seats on the other side of the Chamber about a year since. They maintained that the people of a State had the right to dissolve their connection with this Government, and either remain as an independent State, assuming a distinct nationality, or to affiliate with other States for that purpose ; that the people of a State of the Union may, at their own election, renounce their allegiance to the Federal Government without consultation with
the people of any other State, or of all the remaining States combined; that the continuance of the Union depended on the volition or caprice of the people of each of its parts. I understood the Eenator to lay down the same premises. He said that when this war broke out, every body supposed that a large part of the people of the rebellious districts were logal ; that the war was prosecuted on our part to enable these loyal people to organize and maintain their State governments under the Constitution, as heretofore ; but that if there were no loyal peo ple in any one of these States, it was the end of the controversy; that all just Governments derived their powers from the consent of the governed. Now, Mr. President, as it seems to me, the only conclusion that can be derived from this process of reasoning is, that if the people of a State, with substantial unanimity, desire to secede, they have the right to do so. Nor do 1 anderatand the Senator to have opposed this doctrine this morning. He would not have advieed the people of any State to secede; he does not think it was best for them to secede; he thinks it a great calamity that they shoald attempt to secede; be did not, and perhaps does not still, believe that the people of any one of these States did, with anything like unavimity, give their voluntary assent to any act of secession; but, nevertheless, if they did, in fact, with ordinary unavimity, desire to dissolve the Union, and are still dislogal, and deliberately resist the authority of the Government of the United States, I understand him to maintain that we have no constitutional authority to put them down. I disagree with him. If every inhabitant of any one of the States of the Union desired to secede, I do not admit they have the right to dissolve the Union. I maintain that the provision in the Constitution which says, "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immanties of citizens of the several States," is in direct conflict with that assumption. I claim, as a citizen of the United States from the State of Iowa, that I have a right to the protection of the United States in South Carolina, in Georgia, in Louisiana, and that it is the duty of this Goyernment to afford me the same protection in any other State of the Union that I can claim of this Government in the State in which I happen to reside. Whenever interest, pleasure, or curiosity induces me to enter another State of the Union, the National Government has pledged me its protection. This is an unconditional obligation. It does not depend on the people of the particular locality. 1 am no less a citizen of the United States in South Carolina than in lowa, and my right to claim protection of persca and property, and redress of grievances, is as complete in any other State as in that of my domicil. This view, however, pertains not alone to the individual rights of each citizen. It is equally applicable to the people of the na-
tion in the aggregate. The people of the whole country have the right, in common, to navigate the waters of every part, to carry on commerce, and to use either land or water in making a common defence against a foreign enemy. The rivers, harbors, inlets, bays, and forts in Louisians, Georgia, or in South Carolina, are as much the property of the people of Iowa as of the people of the States named. We are taxed to improve the one and to construct the other, and have a right to demand that they shall be held for the common good. The lisrbors at New Orleans, Charleston, or New York have not been improved and fortified for the people of those localities alone; they are seaports for the people of the interior as much as for those of the coast. And in practice it may be quite as important for the welfare of the people whom I represent in part that a foreign enemy should be met and repelled at New Orleans as at Keokuk or Dubuque.
Nor do I admit the truth of the Senator's corollary that harmonions opposition to the anthority of the United States by the people of the rebel States wonld render it impossible for us to crush the rebellion. I know it is frequently asserted that six or eight million people, fighting for a specific purpose, can never be overcome. These assertions, I think, are made without reflection, and usually by popular orators from the hustings; but when made seriously, in a grave, deliberative body, perhaps the public welfare may require a serious answer. At least members of Congress ought to try it by the light of history before adopting it as a controlling fact in legislating for the perpetuity of a great nation; and they need not travel back very far on the page of history to discover how surprisingly naked the falsehood stands. Ireland was crushed, Scotland was overthrown, and all their people were merged with the English in a common nationality. The English themselves have been more than once completely overrun, and were finally subjugated, and their whole feudal system completely changed. Poland bas been conquered, divided, and her nationality wiped out, so that she no longer has a place among the family of nations.
Mr. COWAN. Allow me to ask the gentleman whether it was not the dissensions of Poland, the very fact tbat she was not united, that caused her overthrow?

Mr. HARLAN. I will answer by asking where is Hungary, a more recent case of rebellion? There were many million people practically united, a martial people, highly cultivated, struggling against a despotic power for their independence, who, within the memory of these boys acting as pages, have been crushed by the superior military power of their enemies.
Mr. COWAN. If the gentleman will allow me, I will refer to Hungary as one of the
strongest examples against his theory. I will ask him whether there were not in Hungary three or four distinct races of men; that they have never been able to unite them in one solid compact body; and whether it was not by means of their dissensions that the Austrians were enabled to overcome them; whether they do not divide and conquer them always?

Mr. LANE, of Kansas. If the Senator from Iowa will permit me, I wish to say but a single word. The Senator from Pennsylvania is opposing a proposition upon this floor that he well knows will divide and array four million people against six million in these rebellious States.

Mr. HARLAN. Although what the Senator from Pennsylvania says may be technically true, that the inhabitants of Hungary, many ages back, may have originated in different nationalities, he knows very well that in that struggle they were practically united. The Aus trians never were able to organize a loyal army in Hungary from her own people antil they bad crushed out the armies led by the Magyars, and seattered their leaders as fugitives over the face of the earth. Nor was there any division of the armed inhabitants of Poland to obstruct the success of her armies in fighting for a nationality then as old and as firmly established as the other nations of Europe. Poland was crushed because her enemies were able to wield superior physical power.
But, sir, the history of the world is full of illustrations. Where is Mexico? Ten million people practically united, a large part of them of Castilian origin, imperious and martial in spirit and habits, accustomed to the use of arms, as a profession and for amusement, from childhood, inhabiting a country far more difficult than the rebel States, and led by a gallant and successful general, whose successes had secured him the title of the Napoleon of America, were crushed by your own arms, when your entire population did not equal the present population of the loyal States of the Union. You sent your armies and munitions of war a thousand miles by sea to invade their homes, and fought them many hundreds of miles south of New Orlesns, and yet, in two short years, you completely crashed her armies, and seattered them in guerrilla bands to prey on their own people like a cloud of locusts. Her nationality was so crushed that your generals were compelled to organize for them a provisional government with which to make treaties of peace and amity, your own government dictating the terms. But, sir, I need not repeat minor examples. I will ask the Senator, if France, within his own memory, was not crushed by the opposing Powers of Europe? In civilization and refinement, in a knowledge of the arts and sciences, in the martial spirit of her people, in the courage, experience, skill, and renown of her field marshals, France has no superior; and jet,
while under the leadership of Napoleon the Great, France was crushed. The Emperor of the French was carried by his captors to an island in the deep sea, where he lived the captive of jealous kings, and died a prisoner of State. France, standing at the head of the nations, was compelled to receive a ruler dictated by her conquerors !

Is it necessary to consume more time in refutation of the assumption, that if the people of the rebel States are united they cannot be conquered? If Ireland could be crushed, if Scotland could be crushed, if England could be crushed, if Poland could be crushed, if Hungary could be crushed, if Mexico could be crushed, and if France herself could be crushed, why may not twenty-four loyal States crush out the rebellion in ten States? If the people of the twenty four loyal States admit their inability, it will be a mournful confession of inferiority which will make their memory a stench in the nostrils of their own posterity.
But, sir, the people of the rebel States are not united. The amendments now pending have been offered on the assumption that there are nearly four million people within the limits of those States who are loyal. In all the States tolerating slavery there are said to be four million slaves. Excluding Delaware, Maryland, Western Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri, probably the negroes are equal to three-sevenths of the entire population. Probably two-sevenths of the whole population and of our race, within the limits of these States, are loyal; or, in the aggregate, five-seventhslof the whole population, black and white. This is not an extravagant estimate. We all know from concurrent history, that a large number of the soldiers in the rebel armies are serving by compulsion ; and handreds of thousands of non-combatants are compelled by these armed conscripts to submit to the rebel authority, to avoid personal violence and the confiscation of their property. The folly of our own Government and commanding generals in the field has exercised no small share of influence in producing this result. We have carefally protected the property of rebels in both loyal and disloyal States, and have spurned the assistance of the loyal portions of communities under the civil control of rebel leaders. The object of this bill is to inaugurate a different policy; to secure the organization of the logal people in the dislogal distriets, under the flag of the Union, and make it the interest of all logal people to aid in establishing the supremacy of the Constitution and the laws; thus adopting in practice the adage, "divide and conquer," used in its highest and most honorable sense.
This policy is demanded by the highest and most sacred considerations of humanity. It would shorten the struggle, and consequently save hundreds of millions of treasure and tens of thousands of valuable lives. What could be
greater folly than to fight the whole population of the rebel districts, when only about twosevenths are your real enemies? What but madness or real disloyalty at heart could induce any commanding general to compel the five sevenths, or less, as the case may be, to acquiesce in and indirectly support the rebellion? Is it not a duty that we owe to ourselves, as well as to them, to avail ourselves of this proffered aid?

I know some of the Representatives and Senators from slaveholding States object to the arming of colored people, and I will consider these objections presently.
We have seen, when examined in the light of history, no sane man could reasonably doubt the ability of the twenty-four loyal States to crush the rebellion in ten States, if the people of the ten were acting as a unit; we have seen also that nothing but the most stupid blindness, if not criminality on our part, can secure unanimity in the rebel districts; hence, that we can crush the rebellion speedily if we act wisely. If any one doubts the correctness of this conclusion, let us judge of our ability in the future by what we have achieved during the past year. It is little more than a year since the war was commenced by the rebels at Fort Sumter, near Charleston. Since then political animosities in all the free States, on which the leaders of the rebellion counted so largely for succor, have been substantially buried; and although we commenced almost without an army and without a navy, whatever there was of rebellious feeling in Delaware has been suppressed; whatever rebellion existed in Marylard has been destroyed; the rebellion in one-third of Virgiaia, the western part of Virginia, has been entirely put down, so that I believe there is hardly a guerrilla left to annoy the peaceful inbabitants; the rebellion in Kentucky has been crushed out, the rebel armies within her limits have melted away into guerrilla bands, and these are rapidly disappearing. Tennessee is under the control of the old flag. The rebellion has been crushed in Missouri. Although overwhelmed from Arkansas to Iowa buta few months since with rebel armies, which controlled the whole country, now her own home guards are able to furnish ample protection to the peaceful pursuits of life. Whatever of rebellion existed in the Territories has been suppressed; large rebel armies have been driven out of New Mexico. The Mississippi river has been opened from Cairo to its month; nearly every fortification on either bank has been cap tured and is now garrisoned by loyal troops. All the great cities of the South threatened or controlled by the rebellion have been captured and are in your possession. St. Louis, Balti more, Alexandria, Wheeling, Norfolk, Lexington, Nashville, Memphis, New Orleans, and a host of towns of minor importance, are all in your possession. Two cities of some political
consequence and of less commercial importance, Richmond and Charleston, only remain in the possession of the rebels. The entire coast from the Rio Grande to the Potomac, and all its defences, are in your possession, and are defended by strong garrisons. The rebel fleets bave been swept from the sea. Not a rebel ship, I believe, remains afloat to excite the cupidity of sailor or marine. Nearly every armed rebel boat has been captured, sunk, or destroyed. The rebels, I believe, have scarcely one gun or man afloat on river, harbor, lake, or ocean. While your gallant Navy has thus effectually destroyed every vestige of rebellion within reach of its guns, your Army has not bzen idle, as is demonstrated in the general results mentioned. Not to particularize hundreds of great successes, yet of minor importance, I might mention the capture of two large rebel armies, with all their guns, supplies, and equipments-one at Fort Henry, the other at Donelson. They bave crushed, routed, and dispersed another at Pea Ridge ; so that what remains of the rebel forces west of the Mississippi is a greater curse to their own friends than annoyance to the Union troops. They have crushed and seattered anotber, far more gigantic in its proportions, at Corinth, so that nothing much superior to a guerrilla warfare is now carried on in either Louisians or Mississippi. Your troops have secured a firm lodgment within the limits of every one of the rebel States. And even in front of Richmond, where the enemy pave concentrated all their forces, apparently for a last desperate effort, and where I doubt hot, on account of this concentration, they outnumbered our own gallant army move than two to one, after a series of pitched battles, extending over a period of seven or eight days, the Union flag is still floating in triumph, the army rests in a more secure position than when the first gun was fired by the enemy, its columns unbroken, undaunted in spirit, buoyant and confident; its flanks fully protected by 3 fleet of gunboats, and its communication with its supplies perfectly secure. If properly reinforced and supported by the Government and people, of which I have no doubt, this gallant, unconquered, and anconquerable army of the Potomac will be able, notwitbstanding the check which it has received, to accomplish the object of the campaign in the course of the next thirty days.
Then I inquire, in all candor, for the cause of the despondence which bas been mavifested in this Chamber. After this review of their aebievements, are we not content with it as the fruits of their toil and exposure for but a single year? The armies of Kome, during her most palmy days, never accomplished half so much in so short a period. It is true manymen have fallen in the field of battle; some have been killed and many wounded, and many more have fallen on account of exposure and sickness incident to camp life. And still oth-
ers have been uselessly sacrificed by drudgery from which it seems to be the purpose of the Senate to relieve them in the fature, and which may be set down as the fruits of the folly, big. otry, or inexperience of generals, who are, io the main, officers of great ability and merit. But all these losses, when added together, are comparatively trivial ; they have not diminished the probabilities of our speedy triumph in the least; nor has the physical power and strength of the nation been diminished on account of the war one iota. I do not doubt but that an enumeration of the population of the United States, if taken to-day, would show our increase during the past year, notwithstanding those losses, to have been as grest as it has been during any other year of the existence of this nation. The Almighty never inflicts on a people two great calamities at the same time. When they are cursed with a war that is sweeping away its thousands, He never has, I think I may say without irreverence He never will, afflict them at the same time with pestilence and famine. I know that the rebels bave been counting on the destruction of our armies by plagues and fevers. I have not. I have known that the people of the whole country would be more vigorous and healthy during the contin uance of this civil war than they have been for an age past. It is in the order of Providence that it should be so; and if Senators will but look around them they will find that it has been so singe the war commenced. You have had no cholera, you have had no yellow fever, you have had no plagues or famine to sweep away your people. The Almighty has visited us with one great curse during the past yearcivil war. This has carried off its thousands. None have died with cholera, plague, or yellow fever; and the ordinary diseases of the country have been of a milder type than usual. We are probably numerically stronger to-day than we were the day the rebels opened their batte. ries on Fort Sumter.
The Senator from New York [Mr. King] says he does not despair of the Republic. Nor do I. Why should I despair? Mr. President, I do not doubt our final success. We not only have the power, but in my judgment will continue to possess the power, if we are but faithful to ourselves, to crush oat whatever still ex. ists of this rebellion.
I am not, however, blind to what seems to me to be the intimations of an overraling Providence, as this struggle progresses, and I would express it, of course, with great deference ; but in my judgment this struggle will not be closed until slavery shall have been practically terminated. I believe that the overruling hand of God is in this war. I believe that He has suf. fered us to come to blows for the very purpose of developing this great good to the human family. There are but two civilized enlight ened nations on earth that permit human
slavery within the limits of their home Gov-ernments-our own and one in South America. Some others permit it in their colonies, but not at their home Government. A century or so since, all tolerated slavery in some form. But during the last hundred years Christianity has achieved great triumphs. Liberty of conscience is now tolerated in a wonderful degree by nearly all the great nations. The Christian religion has been carried into every quarter of the globe. There are now between two and three hundred million Christians in the world. Nearly one-third of the inhabitants of the earth are Christians, and they control all the enlightened nations. It is impossible that these principles should be inculeated without producing their legitimate fruits-the amelioration of the human family. The man who has "fallen among thieves" attracts the sympathy of the Christian world. God intended that it should be so. He intended that those who are sick and in prison shoald be visited by the hand of mercy; He intended that the naked should bs clothed, that the hungry should be fed, that the widow and the orphan should be sheltered, that the weak should be protected, that the oppressed should go free. These purposes of Providence have culminated in a system of free schools embracing the poor in nearly every erslightened nation; in the improvement of prisons and prison discipline; in the liberation of slaves ; in the enfranchisement of serfs; in the construction of asylums for the insane; in the education of the deaf and dumb, and blind, and of idiots; and in the erection and support of hospitals and retreats for the afllicted with every species of loathsome disease. The people of the United States have kept pace with the other Christian nations in every benevolent work except rememberiug our bondmen as if we were in bonds with them, and doing unto them as we would that they should do unto us, had our relative conditions been reversed. When reproached by other nations for acting the laggard, we have arrayed many excuses, but have had one substantial reason, as a nation, for declining to terminate this system withia our limits.
It has been maintained by all our jurists that within the limits of any State of the Union the national Congress has no constitutional anthority to interfere in the regulation of the institutions that reiate exclusively to the internal policy of its people; that the national Government may do whatever is necessary for our external defence, internal peace, and for the promotion of the general welfare; but that the people of each State must be permitted to be the exclusive judge of the propriety of its own local laws, applicable to its own people alone; that on all these subjects this Government should not interfere, shoald not impose its opinions, nor suffer itself to be used as an instrument in the hand of the people of any other State or States
for imposing their opinions and views on the people of any other State. Nobody has entertained that opinion more honestly than I have, nor has anybody been more anxious to carry it out in practice; having, during my short public career, ever maintained this doctrine, both in public and private, as well as by my votes in the Senate.
But, in my judgment, this disability has been removed, and this brings me to consider the further suggestion of the Senator from Pennsylvania, and urged by other Senators. They maintained that all the States that have been in this Union are still in the Union; that, theoretically, the Union has not been dissolved; that a State once existing as a member of this Union cannot, by any act of its own people, be annihilated and cease to be a member of the Union ; that once a State always a State, or, as others have expressed it, " the king never dies; the prince is always in existence." Well, sir, I have anticipated in part the answer to this theory. The argument is superficial. It is the common-law doctrine, applicable to rights of persons and property in a State, that has not died and cannot die. Titles acquired under one prince are not destroyed by the existence of an interregnum ; the title does not terminate on account of the death of the grantor, but must be construed to be a grant from his suecessor, and this perpetuity of title is not to be terminated even during the period when there is no prince. So far as the holder of the franchise of the grantee under the prince is concerned, the prince connot die; that is, the grant continues, the franchise is still good, the title valid, though the king be dead.

To those who argue that a State cannot cease to exist, I inquire where is Poland? Is it still a State? Where is Sparta and the other States of Greece? Where is Carthage? Where is Rome-that Rome over which the consuls presided and the Cæsars ruled? Where is Egyptthat Egypt which was the nursery of learning and the arts before the foundations of the pyramids were laid? Where is Judea, once a State so brilliant and powerful under the reign of King David? Where is Scotland, once the ri val of England, whose death has become im. mortal in the fame of her warrior clans led by her Bruces? But why pursue this subject? An absurdity'needs no refutation. To state it is to expose it. It is fatile to argue that the tyrants who destroyed Poland, as the wolf and the jackall desmember their prey taken in a common chase, had no right to do so: the conclusive fact still exists-Poland was destroyed. She has ceased to exist as a State! She no longer has a place among the nations! If Sparta and Judea and Scotland and Poland ceased to exist as States, so may South Carolina and Georgia and Florida and any other State. If Scotland died by the hand of England, South Carolina may commit suicide! The possibility
of terminating the life of a State is a question of controversy, and not the manner of the death.

If a State government may be destroyed by the people residing within its own boundaries, we inquire in the next place if some of the States of this Union have not been destroyed. If these States have not, in contemplation of law and the Constitution, ceased to exist, they are still States; and if States, they are either in the Union or out of the Union as States.

Now, what is a State? It is not, I apprehend, the land on which a people may happen to live; nor is it the people that may happen to live on the land. It is such a legal organization of the people in one compaet community as will enable it to protect the rights of each and all against all intruders, usually denominated a government, with such officers as will enable it to enact laws and administer justice, and hold intercourse with other States or nations. I inquire if, in South Carolina, there now exists such a State? If so, is it in the Union? If it is a State still in the Union, where is its Governor, where is its Legislature, where is its judiciary? If you recognise it as a State, you must recognise the organs through which the people act. You cannot claim that it is a State because the land is there on which the people live, nor merely because there are people living on the land; but it must be because there is such a political or civil organization of that people as enables you to recognise their existence through their officers-executive, legislative, and judicial.

If you admit that such a State exists within the limits of South Carolina, I humbly submit that it is out of the Union. There is no Governor there whom you can recognise as a Governor; there is no Legislature there that you can appeal to as a Legislature; there are no judges there before whom your people can claim a trial of their rights, and whose adjudications you can recognise as valid.

If a people exist there without an Executive, without a Legislature, and without a judiciary system which you can recognise, is it a State? I maintain that it is not a State; and I think I am sustained in this conclusion by the language of the Constitution itself. It says:
"The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial offcers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bonnd by oath or affirm. ation to support this Constitation; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."
Now, sir, I submit that there is no such Governor; that there are no such judges in any one of the rebel States; that their State organization has ceased to exist; it has been obliterated by their own wicked people. You can no longer recognise the people within those boundaries as a State. You have no means of reaching them through any State organization; and if there is no civil organization through
which you can reach them as the people of a State, the State has ceased to exist.

I submit, in the next place, that the President, in administering the laws in these rebel districts, has as sumed that no State governments exists. If Tennessee and North Carolina are still States of the Union, what right had your President to appoint Governors for their people? If these rebel districts are still States of the Uaion, what constitutional right has the President to proceed to suppress an insurrection aoless requested to do so by the Legislatures thereof, or, during their recess, by the Governors? Again, if these districts are still States of the Union, what right has the President to commission the officers of their militia called into the service of the United States, the Constitution expressly reserving the right to appoint the officers to the States respectively from which they are ca led? His not tha Pres ident treated the people of these rabal districts in all these respects precisely as if they were Territories of the United States? Is it possible for him to administer the laws of the Uuited States within their limits in any other manner?

It is therefore manifest that you are compelled, in your official action, to hold and govern them as organized Territories, or to acknowledge their independence. In what, then, does any one of these rebel States differ from Nebraska, or any other Territory of the Union? In nothing whatever except the naked pretence that a State government once existing can never cease to exist, in violation of the historical fact that they have ceased, and do cease to exist, either through the madness of their own people, or in consequence of the superior strength of their enemies. Your President has elected to consider the State governments within these old State boundaries extinct. For all practical purposes they are dead. All the State laws lie as a dead letter on the statate-books, unless you choose to revive them. But if you have power to revive them and give them vitality, you may enaet other laws as yon would enact laws for any other Territory. The people are citizens of the United States; they have a right to claim the protection of the laws of the United States; and your President, with your sanction, is proceeding to organize provisional local governments within the limits of those States as rapidly as they sre overrun by your armies. It is true that he expects, and we expect, that when this rebellion shall have been sappressed, these people will reorganize their State governments, and become mambers of the Union. But while this practical death continues, Congress and the President are responsible for the character of their civil goveraments and their local institutions, as in any other Territory of the United States.

In my opinion you have not only the right to govern the people of these rebel States as Territories, but it is your duty to do so; and,
moreover, that you can never suppress the renellion in any other manner. Civilized people cannot live with each other in large numbers without a civil government. Property must be bought and sold, wills must be made, deaths will occur, estates must be administered, marriages must be solemnized, debts must be collected, and criminals must be punished. If you do not furnish them the necessary legal means for the transaction of all this busine3s, even loyal men must adopt the rebel government. Every civilizəd community soon learns that a bad goverament is better than none; hence they will submit to an illegitimate prince to avoid anarehy.
Bat if you have the right, and it is your duty t? organize temporary governments for these districts as you do for other Territories, you have the right to extend to them all general laws enacted for the people of the Territorios. Yoa have the same discretion in the one case that you have in the other. As to these rebel States, you are no longer restrained by the Constitution from liberating the slaves if the interests of the country and the perpetaity of the Union require it. That they will be liberated before the war is concluded, I have not the siightest doubt; and I may as well state that this conviction is derived in part from what is known to be the will and wish and prayerfal expectation of the slaves themselves. I think one of the most conclusive evidences of the immortality of the human soal is the existence throughout the whole human family of a desire for immortality ; and I believe it is the opinion of theologians who have written on this sabject, that an all-wise Being of infinite mercy and wisdom and omnipotent power would not implant in the mind of allopeople of all ages a longing, thirsting desire to live forever, snd intend to thwart that wish. He could not be a good Being and implant that desire, and at the same time intend to thwart it. It is inconsistent with all the ideas we have of His perfection. Well, sir, we know that these people-and there are four millions of them-have been anxiously looking forward to the time when they shall be liberated. They have been praying for it, and they now hail your troops as they enter the rebel States as the messengers of their liberation, and it is only by thrusting them from your ranks at the point of the bayonet that you can prevent them from uniting with you to suppress the enemies of the country. I do not believe that the Almighty Being who rules the world, a Being of infinite wisdom and goodness, will thwart the wish of this great multitude of His children. Their ancestors were brought here in a very degraded condition. By their associations with civilized communities they have been greatly improved. They have attained that condition in the scale of existence which requires a change in their relations. I have no doubt the time has arrived when the A1.
mighty intends that they shall be free, and men read events very blindly, as blindly as did the Pharaohs of Egypt, who can look at this great subject in any other light. You may delay the fulfilment of this parpose of Providence until all the plagues that visited Egypt have been poured out on this nation and until the blood of the first born of the entire nation has commingled with the waters of your rivers, before you yield to this intimation of infinite wisdom; but in the end it will be accomplished; if not with your concurrence, it will be by the intervention of other uations.

My reasons for this I will state as briefly as I can. First, we have not and never bave had the hearty friendship of any monarchy on earth. Our Government was orgatized on principles in direct condlict with their theory of civil society. They have always maintained that the masses of the people are incapable of self.government, and if now ours should be destroyed, it would afford overwhelming practical proof of the utter futility of all efforts to support a republic. Despots will point with a sneer to the failure of "the great Republic across the Atlantic," as the last fearful example of the folly of mankind in this respect. They have, therefore, a great stake in this issue. If by any act of theirs, or by any influence they are able to bring to bear, not dangerous in its ultimate consequences to their own existence, they can secure the permanent dissolution of the Union, and in the end the division of the residue into many fragments, to be trampled under foot or spit upen at the caprice of the great Powers, they will have furnished a demonstration of man's incapacity for self-government that all the lovers of freedom in the world will not be able to refute. Who, then, can doubt their disposition to aid the rebellion?

But they cannot intervene without a pretext that will meet the approval of the moral sense of mankind. No merely material interest will justify their intervention in favor of a rebellion against an established Government. The example might be contagious. It is not the in terest of crowned heads to sanction insurrections. The scarcity of cotton will never induce England or France to intervene. The support of their operatives directly from their public treasuries until a supply can be secured from other quarters would cost them much less than the cost of a war with the United Statas for a single month. To interpose an armed mediation would be equivalent to a declaration of war which they cannot afford to make for cotton. They will not, therefore, at the beginning, probably, propose a direct armed intervention in favor of the rebels. When intervention comes, if it ever should come, it will be a moral intervention. They will advise us to agree to a dissolution; they will advise us that the material interests of both parts of the country and the welfare of the human family require it. If we persist in
our parposes, as we shall, they may induce the rebels to adopt an act of emancipation on condition of recognition. They can then exhibit us to the world as the persistent prosecutors of a war for dominion, and against the interests of hamanity. They will prove this from our own State papers, written by our great Secretary of State since this struggle commenced, in which he has distinctly informed the great Powers that the relative condition of the people in the rebellions States is to remain unchanged, let this struggle terminate as it may.
Hence, in the contingency I have supposed we would be placed before the democracy of Europe clearly in the wrong, fighting for dominion and the perpetuity of slavery. With the sympathies of the masses of Europe against ns, with the four million slaves probably armed in support of the rebellion, with the promise of freedom as the reward of their success, and with the predisposition of all the crowned heads to suffer republics to destroy themselves, my confidence in our ultimate success would be greatly diminished. We would, of course, still succeed, if God continued to be on our side. But in that contingency, I am not certain that we could count on his blessing. If Napoleon and England should interpose to create a new nationality, and to liberate four million slaves, they might claim to be intervening in the interests of mankind, and in accordance with the great ideas that control the civilization of the age. Putting the intervention on this ground, I am not certain that you could safely rely on the friendship of the Emperor of the Russians, on whose support we have relied more strongly than on any other nation. After having liberated the serfs of his own empire, how could he be expected to make a diversion in our favor, and thus assist to rivet the shackles on our slaves? I believe we' may count on his friendship to checkmate our enemies in the Old World, always, when we deserve it; but could we expect him, after having carried into effeet this great edict making citizens of many millions of his own serfs, to interpose in the face of the other Christian nations to enable us to perpetuate slavery within our limits? It would be unreasonable to expect it. We should therefore anticipate them by making it the interest of many millions of the people of the rebel States to assist us, and the interest of humanity that we should triumph.
If we act wisely and in accordance with these intimations of an overruling Providence, I do not believe the combined Powers of the earth can put us down or intervene between us and the certain achievement of a glorious destiny; hence I was gratified beyond measure with the statement made by the Senator from Kentucky, in his place on the floor of the Senate, a day or two since, that if the perpetuation of this Union required it, every slave that he owned should freely go, and every slave owned by his neigh-
bors in Kentucky would be freely given to save the country. I believe that the time is now at hand when these great sacrifices are demanded, when some plan for the liberation of the slaves, especially in the rebel States, should be adopted, and the able-bodied men incorporated into our armies, if we would successfully maintain this struggle for the perpetuation of our nationality. As I conceive, the door has been thrown open by the hand of God. There is no longer any constitutional difficulty. These State governmeats having been destroyed, the country and the people still remaining under our jurisdiction within the boundaries of the United States, it is not only right, but it is our daty, to organize temporary civil governments and maintain them until the people shall have reorganized their State governments under the provisions of the Constitation. If this is the correct view of the subject, you may pass whatever laws, within the limits of those rebel States, that might be rightfully enacted for any other Territory under the jurisdiction of the United States, and in which no State government exists, including laws for the liberation of slaves, and their organization for the common defence.

Hitherto good men throughout the North and West have justified the continuance of slavery, as the Senator from Pennsylvania did to day, on the ples that we have no power to abolish it within the States; that this toleration of sla very was a part of the original bargain when the Constitution was adopled; that you and I were parties to that contract. I have faith fully lived up to it until the State governments within the limits of these rebel States have been destroyed by the wiekedness of their own people, and the country reduced to the condi tion of a Territory. But now they have no civil government that we can recognise under the Constitution; the people and the country are still within the limits and under the jurisdietion of the United States. I would, therefore, interpose, and give them a goverament as I would any ot er community within our jurisdiction having none that can be recognised by us or by other nations. I would enaet for their government jast such laws as in my judgment their interests and the interests of the nation and of humanity demand.
If I read the signs of the times correetly, this has be some a necessity. We cannot, if we per sist in our folly, thwart the ultimate purposes of the Almighty. By his providential interpo sitiou He has thrown open the door for the liberation of a nation of bondmen ; He has removed the constitutional impediment; He has caused their assistance to be necessary for the perpetuity of the Union and the integrity of the nation. If we sccept of this high destiny, all the uations of earth combined agaiust us would be as flax in the flames; but if we are not equal to the demands of the age, and obstinately refuse to follow the plain intimations of

Providence, this great work will be handed over to other nations, or will be wrought out by the rebels themselves, and our nation will become permanently divided.
But if we adopt this policy, Senators inquire, what shall be done with the liberated slaves? I answer, muster a portion of the able-bodied men into the service of the Republic, employ them in your camps and fortifications as laborers, or your transports and gunboats as laborers and sailors, and, if necessary, let them participate in the glories of the battle field, and bear their jost proportion of the burdens and dangers of this great conflict. And as for the residue, let them alone ; let them take care of themselves hereafter, as many of them have heretofore.
Senators talk of them as savages, as if they had been recently caught in the jungles of Africa and brought to our shores, without a language, without knowledge, without civiliza. tion. This was true of their ancestors, but not of the present generation. A great change has been wrought in their condition; they are now comparatively well civilized. There are eleven thousand of these men that you call savages right at your door, in the District of Columbia. By an act of this Congress some one or two thousand more have been set free. When that bill was under diseussion, I remember that the Senator from Kentacky, [Mr. Davis,] and some other Seuators, in whose wisdom I generally confide, and for whose opizions I have very high respect, told us that if such a law should be enacted the slaughters of St. Domingo would be re-enacted ; that these black people could not live in peace as freemen among a white people; that a war of races would spring up, which would result in the destruction of the one race or the other.
Has this prediction been falfilled? Have any riots occarred? Have suy murders been committed by these freed men? Notone! On the passage of that law these ignorant people, as you may deem them, collected in their churches and school houses where they were accustomed to worship, to praise the Almighty for their deliverance ; and after this manifestation of gratitude they all quietiy returned to the peaceful pursuits of life; since which everything has progressed as usual. These people are now, as heretofore, laborers in your fields and shops, and servants iu your houses. No. body has been damaged; no riots have arisen; society bas not been discomposed in the least, notwithstanding the very extraordinary speeches of the gentlemen who happened to represent what are called the border States in the two branches of Congress. If Senators will open their eyes and look at these people, they will discover that they are no longer savages, but, in a comparative point of view, highly civilized. They provide for their own wants, they provide their own food and clothing and shelter, and for
the education of their own children, for the sup port of their own charches and schools, and bury their own dead; and during the seven years of $m y$ service at the capital of the nation I have never seen a negro beggar-not one. I have seen white beggars; I have seen white boys and girls begging for a penny of each passer by at the crossings; I have seen stal wart men and women, of almost every nationality, begging in your streets and thoroughfares; but never yet have I seen a negro beggar in the streets of the capital of the nation.

In Baltimore, within an hoar's run from this capital, it is said there are about thirty-eight thousand colored people. Of these about two thousand two handred are slaves. There are nearly thirty-six thousand free colored people living in the commercial metropolis of Maryland, and no one conversant with their condition will dare to assert on the floor of the Sen ate that they are either paupers or criminals. There, ns here, they provide for their own wants; by the sweat of their own brow they earn their own bread. They feed, clothe, and shelter their own families, bury their own dead, educate their own children, and there, as here, support their own pecaliar forms of religious worship. With these illustrations right at your door, and within an hour's ride of the capital, will any Senator stand on the floor of the American Senate, and forfeit his repatation for candor in declaring these people to be savages? They are more highly civilized than the children of Israel when they were led out of Egypt by the hand of God, and probably folly equal to them, in this respect, when they returned from Babylon. They will compare very favorably in civilization with the masses of the peasantry of Europe, and I challenge any one who is curious to the comparison. And yet with thousands of these free colored people all around us, directly before our eyes, a standing gigantic demonstration of this inexcasable falsehood, Senators persist in debate in calling them savages, and insist that they shall not be armed in the defence of our common country, lest it may shock the sensibilities of mankind, and stimulate the great Powers to interfere and end a war that under such a policy must result in the indiseriminate slaughter of men, women, and children. I am amazed at such speeches from the lips of American Senatora, whose candor ought not to be lightly called in question. But is it possible that these Senators do not know that every nation on earth having colored inhabitants has incorporated them into its armies? On this subject permit me to quote a few passages on concurrent history :

[^0]burden, and to encount ir, in common with the whites, the risks of loss of life.
"Thus, we flod that in the Spanish colony of Cuba, with a population one-half slaves and one-gixth colored, a militia of free blacks and mulattoes was directed by General Pezuela (Governor General) to be organiz d in 18.54 throughout the latind, and it wis put upou an equal footing with regard to privilege with tho regular army. This measure was not rescinded by Governor General Concha in 1855, but the black and malatto troops have boen made a permanent corps of the Spanish army. (Coadensed in the very phranes of Thrasher's preface to his odition of Humbolats Cuba.)
"In the Portuguese colonies on the const of Africa, the regiments are chiedy compossd of black min. At Prince's Island the garrison consists of a company of regular artillery of elighty, and a regitnent of black militia of tea hundred and fifty-eight rank and file, of which the colonol is a white man. At St. Thomas's there are two regiments of black militia. In Loando, the Portuguese can, on an emergency of war with the natives, bring into the field twentyIive thonsund partially civilized blacksarmand with muskots. (From Valdez's Six Years on the West Coast of Africa. Loaion, 1861. Two vols, 8vo.)
"In the Dutch co'ony of the Gold Coast of Arrica, with a popalation of one hundred thonsani, the garrison of the fortress consists of two hundred soldiers, whites, malattoes, and blacks, under a Datoh colonel.
"In the capital of the Freach colony of Sengigat, on the same coast, at St. Douis, the deteace of the place is in the hands of eigat huudred white and throe hundred black soldiers. (The preceding facts are also from Valdez)
"In the Danish island of St. Croix, in the West Indies, for more than twenty-five years past, there have beon employed two corps of colored soldiers, in the presence of slaves. (From Tuekerman's Santa Crizz)
" In Brazit, notwithstanding its three million slaves, its monarchical Government employs all colors and races in the military service, either by enlistunent or forcible seizure. The police of the city of Rio de Janeiro is a millitary organization, composed mostly of colored men, drilled and commanded by army officers. The navy is principally maned by civilized aborigines. (Hifder; Ewbank.)
"The course purs ed by the British Govermment in Jamaica, Slerra Loone, and Hindostan, is so notorlous as simply to ned to be mentioned.
${ }^{4}$ It. Turkey, no distiaction of color or race is made in the ranks of the regular army.
Is it probable that the English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Brazilians, Turks, Dines, and Datch, after reviewing their own colored regiments in Canada, South America, Africa, the Esst and the West Indies, would suffer materially in their sensibilities in witnessing regiments of colored men in Sonth Carolina?
The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Davis] bas suggested that it would be dangerons to arm regroes on account of the peculiarities of their character. He says that when they once obtain the smell or taste of blood they become demons, and are controlled with great difficulty. But this objection cannot apply to them as soldiers; their qualities and capacity in this respect have been tested by the Dutch, English, and French. The question has therefore been settled. I drew the inference, however, that in the opinion of the Senator, arming slaves would unfit them forever for the service of their masters. I do not complain of him for bringing this to the attention of the Senate. I believe wise statesmen have entertained the same opinion in every age; our ancestors were equally impressed with this conviction, and consequently always provided for the emancipation of slaves who had served in our armies. This principle has not been overlooked by my colleague [Mr. Grimes] in preparing the pending amendments to this bill. They pro-
vide that colored men may, at the diseretion of the President, enter the military and naval service of their country, and that all those who respond to this call shall, at the conclusion of the struggle, be entitled to their freedom. This is right; no slave who has borne arms as a soldicr or seaman would afterwards be fit for slavery.

I am reminded that one of these amendments also provides that their wives and children shall be freed. Well, Mr. President, could a wiser policy be adopted or one better calculated to prompt them to fight with determination for the perpetuity of your institations than the prospect of their own liberty and the liberty of their wives and of their children and children's children for all time to come? An army composed of such soldiers could never be conquered.
But, Mr. President, many may be liberated by the provisions of this bill and necessary kindred measures during the progress of the war who may not be needed, and who may be unfit for the public service. What shall be done with them? My answer has been partially given under another head. I will only add here one other reflection. We have seen that wherever free colored people are found in this country they provide for themselves. They do not become a burden on society. No con siderable number of them become either paupers or criminals. If they have not proved incompetent to provide for themselves heretofore, the presumption is that no considerable number of them will hereafter. But if they should, then interpose with legal provisions for their protection as you would for the protection of paupers of any other class. When other men women, or children, in civilized society, are found to be incapable of taking care of themselves, the laws require the courts of probate to appoint guardians of their persons and property, who are required to give bond and approved security for the faithfol execution of the guardianship. The ear of the court is ever open to the complaint of the ward, whether made by him in person or by "his next friend." The guardian is thus bound by law and stimalated by public opinion to execate faithfully and humanely this trust. Let these same prio ciples of justice apply to black paupers that are applied to paupers of any other color. If justice and humanity require such restraints to secure the rights and interests of orphans and paupers and non compos of our own color and race, how much more dangerous must it be to place infants and paupers of anothor race aud color under the absolute control of self-appointed guardians without the slightest restraints o law, to be worked or punished or sold or used as unrestrained passion or caprice might prompt? If any of the liberated slaves should prove incapable of providing for themselves, apply the same principles of justice to them that you now
apply to such persons of any other class, and the whole difficulty will have been met and overcome. In my State we have the same laws for the protection and management of paupers of all classes, and I believe this is done in a majority of the States without causing the slightest difficulty. And there is no necessity for a distinction in this respect in a rebel State. If large numbers of these people are destitute of intelligence or capacity to provide for themselves and to protect their own interests in any given locality, it creates no necessity for a new rule. The application of the principles that protect the few will be sufficient to protect larger numbers. If, therefore, a majority of liberated Africans were found by experience to be incompotent to provide for themselves, society would not receive the slightest shock. They would receive the protection of guardians appointed by the courts, under bond with ap. proved security, responsible to the tribunals of justice for their conduct; and society would receive the advantages of their labor and service afterwards as before, and the laborer would be secured in the enjoyment of the proceeds of his toil.
But we have seen that this allegation of incompetency to provide for themselves is not true. It may be partially true in limited localities and in certain communities, but as a general proposition it is totally false. On this point it might not be amiss to give the testimony of a rebel Senator, by whose side I sat in the old Chamber for several years. I refer to the rebel Robert Toombs. In private conversation he told me repeatedly that there was no practical difficulty in liberating the slaves; he said it was all a pretence; the men who asserted this doctrine were demagogues. He said that he defended slavery because, in his judg. ment, it was right; it was for his interest and the interest of his people to perpetuate it; and almost every old Senator here will recognise such a statement as characteristic of his boldness and candor. My friead from New Hamp. shire says that he told him the same thing. Wise statesmen and candid men, all over the slave States, admit the same thing. It is only from the lips of politicians-I will not say demagogues, for that would be of-fensive-that we hear of the impossibility of preserving peace and order in a community composed in part of free negroes. They talk of the practical difficulties in the way of emancipation, until they have impressed society with the conviction that free negroes are exceedingly dangerous to civil society. When examined candidly in the light of our own experience and that of other nations, these supposed difficulties vanish; the mountain becomes at once but a molehill. While the Senator from New Hampshire was speaking, some one handed me a note stating that the navy in Brazil is composed of negroes, with the excep-
tion of the officers. My colleague and the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs tell me that time out of mind our own navy has been supplied in part with colored seamen. Hence we perceive that they may be used with impunity in our armies and navy, for the common defence in time of war, and that they may be governed and controlled, as freemen, in times of peace, without the slightest danger to civil society.

Then, if there is no practical difficulty, and the hand of God has thrown open their prison doors, and you no longer are embarrassed by constitutional impediments, and it is your interest to do so, why not adopt a policy which may probably result in the liberation of all the slaves in the rebel States? I admit that the passage of this bill and smendments may have that effect; I think it will. I think that will be the practical effect of the policy proposed. The bill provides for the liberation of all those that shall have been employed in the armed service of the United States, with their wives and children; and I do not doubt that it will lay the foundation for the liberation, sooner or later, of the mass of the colored popalat on of the rebel districts, and ultimately of the whole country. This does not alarm me. A careful examina tion of the whole subject, including a candid analysis of the argaments of objectors, my own observation, and the observations of others of the higbest intelligence, illustrated by the history and experience of other nations, convinces me that this policy will not involve us in the slightest danger. I know other Senators have expressed great fear. But I do not think they have examined the subject with sufficient care. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Davis] has been very earnest in urging the greatest forbearance. It is manifest to all aequainted with his candor that he entertains the most serious apprehensions. He has repeatedly cautioned the Senate against a policy that he evidently fears might cause a repetition of the bloody scenes of St. Domingo. But a careful examination of that case will prove that it is always more davgerous to do wrong than to act justly. It is hardly necessary for me to inform the Senator that the French Deputies had provided by law for the freedom of all the slaves on the island; but their masters resisted the decree, and attempted by force to continue their bond age contrary to law. Smarting under this flagrant injustice, the slaves undertook the vindication of their own rights under the laws of France; and in their redress of this g ievance they did commit some acts of barbarity. They did it, however, in defence of their legal rights. By law they were free. Their masters attempted the folly of continuing their bondage in violation of law, and they suffered a fearful penalty. But, sir, were these negroes singular in this? Did they not in this act very much like white people? You, sir, would have acted substan-
tially as they did; so would the Senstor from Kentucky himself. All men love liberty. Slavery is sufficiently galling when sanctioned by the law of the land; bat should you attempt to impose on any one chains contrary to law, could you expect him to submit to the outrage? You would not, Mr. President; nor would I; nor would the Senator from Kentucky. Under these circumstances very few would have hesitated to strike for their liberty. Had it bees done by white men it would heve received the praise of mankind. It was this persistence in a gigantic wrong by the slaveholders, in violation of the law of the land, that drenched St. Domingo in blood.

But admitting that there is no practical difficulty, I am aware that Senators and others frequently sugrest that this policy would inaugurate a condition of society which white people would not tolerate. They inquire, " what will you do with the blacks even if they should prove to be competent to provide for their own support? Will you put them on a platform of equality with the white people; will you make this mass of negroes throughout the whole country equal with your own sons and daughters? Are you in favor of the equality of the races?" When I have heard such suggestions from the stump during the excitement of political camprigns, I have sometimes answered in terms of ridicule; but that does not become this presence, and I shall, therefore, for once, treat the interrogatories with a careful and candid analysis.
Then what is meant by the phrase " equality of negroes with white men?" Do Senators mean physical equality ; that the liberation of a negro slave would necessarily make him physically equal to the white man? The inquiry alone in this analytical form renders it ridiculous. I apprehend that his skin would still be black; that his lips would be thick ; that his heel would be long; that his foot would be flat; that his skull would be thick; and that he would be less symmetrical and beautiful in form than the white man, and probably less capable of enduring fatigue and toil in a climate adapted equally to the temperament of each. It is probable that the white race is capable of greater endurance than any other race of men on earth. It is not, therefore, I conclude, the apprehension of physical equality that exeites this apparent alarm.
Then is it mental equality? Do they intend to inquire if, in our opinion, this would make the negro equally acute in bis mental perceptions with the white man ; make his memory equally retentive, his powers of comparison and reasoning equally reliable, or his logic equally conclusive, or his will equally persistent with that of the white man? I apprehend that nobody anticipates any such result from the enactment of any law. His physical and mental organization would remain afterwards,
as before, subject to the ordinary laws of creation and cultivation.

Then is it moral equality to which objection is made? By moral capacity I suppose is meant that power of the human mind or heart that recognises moral obligations as the concomitant of certain relations in life ; that is to say, when I perceive that a certain human being is my father and another one is my child, there springs up an emotion that we call moral obligation to reverence the one and to provide for the other. When we perceive the relations that exist between members of a family, as husband and wife, brother and sister, the same kind of spontaneous emotion springs up, usually denominated moral obligation. When we contemplate the relation that exists between the citizen and the Government, the subject and the prince, between man and man as members of the human family, or between man as the creature and God as the Creator, we experience certain emotions, which we denominate patriotism, loyalty, bumanity, and piety, and which prompt us to perform corresponding acts ; they are called moral acts, because they are said to spring from this feeling of moral obligation Now, is it equality in these respects to which Senators object? Do they object to making colored men free, and to allowing them to "know" their owa wives, and to be able to recognise their own children, lest they may experience moral emotions-feelings of obligation to provide for them and protect them on a platform of equality with white men? I ap. prehend that it is not the kind of equality that gentlemen refer to, and which they fear may result in the destruction of hamau society.

Perlaps some one would suggest that it is social equality with negroes that white men loathe. Hence I now pay my respects to the apprehensiou of evil under this head. What is meant by social equality? Isuppose that the social intercourse of men with each other is the result of the mutual discovery on their part of a congeniality resulting from common aspirations, cesires, inclinations, and tastes, and which prompt them to seek common means of enjogment. Now, I inquire, if it is necessary to pass a law to regulate a man's associations, would you expect to be able by the enactment of a law of Congress to make any one the equal or the inferior of the Senator from Ken tucky as a social being, or to make any other two gentlemen, without reference to race or color, the equals of each other in a social point of view? Is social intercourse a fit subject of legislation? Do not our associations grow out of and depend on other causes? Are they not the inevitable result of similarity of habits, tastes, dispositions, temperament, and congeniality of spirit? In a free country is it possible to control social intercourse by the enact ment of a law? You might have covered the statute-books of Kentucky all over with laws
to the contrary, and Hon. Richard M. Johnson would have associated with a negro wench as his wife. They were the social equals of each other. Intellectually he was probably her superior, but socially they were exact equals. In temperament, disposition, and tastes, each found the other a boon companion. This was not the result of the legal abilities or disabilities of either. He was a free man, and she, I believe, was a slave. This association did not spring from her liberation; this social equality was not the result of abolition. It occurred in a slave State, in the bosom of a slavebolding community. Nor was it an isolated case, as is demonstrated beyond all dispute or cavil by the presence of an immense mulatto population in every slavebolding State.
It may be objected that this illustration pertains more to the family relations than to social intercourse. But I answer, it is all the more conelusive on that account. The family relations furnish the most sacred means of social intercourse; it gives society a permanency which makes its members more directly amenable to the civil authorities. Hence, if even here men follow their tastes regardless of the restraints of law, how would you hope to control by legal enactments the more miscellaneous social intercourse of life? It is literally impossible. It does not depend on legal provisions.
Mr. DAVIS. Will the honorable Senator permit me to ask him a question?
Mr. HARLAN. Certainly.
Mr. DAVIS. I ask the honorable Senator if in a good many of the Northern Statss the free negro is not allowed to vote?

Mr. HARLAN. I will come to that in a moment.
Mr. DAVIS. I ask if in the State of Massachasetts he is not allowed to practice law?
Mr. SUMNER. Certainly ; a lew to ber honor.
Mr. DAVIS. I was addressing my question to the honorable Senator from Iowa. Lask the bonorable Senator, too, whether in Massachusetts there was not a law some time ago forbidding intermarriage between the white race and the negro race, and whether that law within the last few years has not been repealed. Is that to your honor, too? I ask the Senator if he would consider a general matrimonial alliance between the two races in Massachusetts to their honor?
Mr. HARLAN. I have great respect for the Senator from Kentucky, and have had since I began to notice our public men; although he may have known but little of me, being somewhat his junior, I have known him a long time, and have contemplated his character with great pleasure during his whole political career. I know that the Senator does not trifle with any subject, that he speaks with candor, and that he propounds these questions with the expectation of a candid reply.
[The honorable Senator here gave way temporarily for the consideration of reports from committees of conference ; after which he proceeded.]
When I gave way I was stating that social equality was the result of mutual wishes, de sires, tastes, and purposes on the part of the individual seeking social intercourse, and was not a legitimate subject of legislation. I will not pursue this farther than to say that the possession of wealth by some, and the destitution of others, rendering them unequal in abil. ity to command the means of common enjoy: ment, must exert a powerfal influence on social intercourse. With this modification, the posi tion I bave taken appears to me to be impreg. nable. And this leads me to reply in regular order to the interrogatories of the Senator from Kentucky. First, whether the people of the free States of different colors are inhibited by the State laws from intermarriage. This question might have been propounded with greater propriety by me to him, as I have no donbt he is familiar with the statutory provisions of the various States ; bat I will answer that in some of the free States there is no such law. In some of them sach laws existed for a time and were then repealed. I remember that in Indiana, the State in which I was brought up, a law existed for a year or so requiring every young man on application for marriage license, to make satisfactory proof, by oath or otherwise, that his intended bride was not a negress ; but the young men rebelled against this requirement. They regarded it as an imputation on their tastes, habits, and associations, and the law was repealed. They did not deem that such a presumption, as applicable to them, was just; that no officer had a right to presume that they could entertain a desire to seek a negress for a wife. I suppose the Senator is now sufficiently answered on that point. If I were disposed to be facetious, I would inquire of him if he deemed it necessary in Kentucky, to prevent the intermarriage of white people with negroes, to prohibit it by a penal statute. Such a law would be a standing insult to the white population of his State. There may be a few such intermarriages in any State, either with or without the sanction of law ; and without the sanction of law more of them occur in slave communities than in the free States, so that an application of the argument involved in his interrogatory is directly in favor of the liberation of the slave population. Have there been any such marriages consummated in Washington city between the white people and the slaves who were liberated a few months since by a law of Congress? I think none have occurred; and the apprehension is perfectly groundless. Sir, is there no other reason for the separation of the black and white races, in their matrimo nial alliances, than the penalties of the criminal law? Has the hand of nature fixed no
barrier to such loathsome associations? Will they instinctively spring into each other's arms in the absence of legal restraints? Are the charms of the negro wench so far superior to those of the Cancasian maid as to enable the first to outstrip the latter in a fair competition for the attentions of the sterner sex? And do your young men deem themselves so far inferior in gallantry tothe sable sons of Africa as to need the assistance of a criminal code to exclude the latter when paying their devotions at the shrine of female loveliness? Are they not content with the natural superiority with which nature has clothed them? Sir, in my State we have no such law. None is needed. I sappose no such law exists in the Senator's own State ; if so, it is a standing disgrace to the people, for it implies that their tastes lead them to such associations.
The Senator inquired whether politica' equality was not implied in the suggestions of the proposition before the Senate and the argument that I have attempted to present. To this I reply that there is no such thing as political equality in nature. Political equality never did, and never will, exist between all the members of any eivil society, whether of the same or of different races. It does not exist hero. It does not exist in any one of the States of this Union. In the first place, about one half of the entire white population of the whole country is disfranchised; can exercise no politica! privileges whatever; can neither vote nor hold office nor bear arms. I refer to that better portion of society which always commands our highest regards. And perhaps their exclusion from the political are ca ought to be considered as the result of our reverence for them, and net in the nature of a disability. Another very large proportion of the white population are disfranchised; all those under twenty-one years of age, even of the males, are entirely exeluded from the enjoyment of political privileges. And all those of forcign birth who have lived in the country less than five years are entirely excluded under your natiralization laws. Houce you percelve there is but a small fraction of the entire population of this country who are politically eutranchised, and these enjoy political privileges in various degrees.
I will not pursne this branch of the subject further than to remark that I suppose the principle on which political rights are conferred on members of any civil community is a supposed capacity on their part to hold, enjoy, and exercise these privileges with safety and advantage to socioty itself. It is supposed to be inconsistent with the safety and perpetuity of civil society that those under twenty-one years of age, as a general rule, should be permitted to bold the reins of Goverament, or to control the polley of the State; and bence they are excluded. It is on the ground of incapacity - not that all under that sge are incompetent, but that a majority probably are; and the rule is made general on account of the difficulty of legislating for each individual. The same may be said of our adopted fellow-citizens, All do not require a residence of five years to qualify them for the performance of the dutics of Americam citizens. Some are as intelligent whon they first land on our shores as the average, at least, of the native inhabitants; but, as a general rule, a residence of five years would be necessary to Camiliarize them with our inst.tutions and laws, so as to enable them to exercise discreetly and safeiy the rights of citizenship.
The Indians, as a class, are excluded on the same ground; small bands and remnants of tribes alone are included as voters; and these only by special acts of Congress, when their autainments and their improved position in the scale of civilization would seem to justify it. When supposed to be incompetent to exercise these rights safely, they are universally excluded. So it should be in relation to the negro population. The same princlples should be applied. My own State, for example, excludes the whole negro population from the enjoyment of the right of suffrage and the right to hold office, not on account of color, but on account of supposed incapacity to exercise those rights safely for themselves or others. All of them are not, but a very large majority are believed to be incompetent to exercise disereetly these high prerogatives; and as we cannot very well
legislate in relation to each individual, all are excluded.
I understand that several of the free Staces of the Northwest, $11 l i n o l s$ and Indiana, and perhaps others, have enacted similar laks. They exclude them because, in their judg. ment, they are incompetent-the principle on which all other classes are excluded which are not permitted to exercise these privileges. Their iiberation from slavery would produce no immediate change in their character in this respect, and would not inyolve the necessity of ciothing therm with high civil trusts. Nor could this continued disability on their part be justly considered a hardship; as well might the land-lubber complain that he is Lot permitted to stand at the helm and guide the ship, when the safety of all on board requires that it should be navigated by the tnost experienced seaman. The welfare of the negroes themselves requires that the slip of State should be guided by experienced hands; they have no more right to complain of this exclusion thin any other class which we bave mentioned. They may enjoy all the blessings of civil liberty without the right to vote and hold office. Unnaturalized foreigners are as free before as they are after their uaturalization. Iadies and minor chituren are free; they are citizens of the Republic, citizens of the various States, and yet they do not particirate in the exjoyment of any of these political privi leges. In the exclusion of uny and all of these classes from the eajoyment of political rights, the States act on the same principle; they are supposed to be, if they are not in fact, incompetent, aud the sadety of the community requires that they shonld be thus excluded until the requisite intelligence shall be secured.
Then, sir, if I have auswered the Senator's questions sufticiently, I inquire what has become of the taunt of " negre equality $\varphi$. What has become of the sneering inquiry, whether those who propose to arm the black men, and at the end of their military service to give them freedom, istend to seeure their equality with the white race? We have seen that the liberation of negro slaves does not imply that thoy aud the white man will thence become physically equal, mentally equal, morally equal, socially equal, or politically equal; but they shall be equal with the white race in their right to themselvos and the enjoyment of the proceeds of their own labor; they shall from that time forward bein a position to fulfil the conditions of the origiual curse that man should ears his bread by the sweat of his own face; that he shall earn it for himself and those immodiately dependent upon him, and not be compellod to earn it for another. They will be cqual with white men in their right to justice and the protection of the laws; they shall have an equal right to the free use of their own bodies, their own intellects, their own moral affections, and the right to apply the proceeds of their own labor to the promotion of their own welfare and the welfare of their dependent families; and if at shall be found by experience that any of them are incompetent to provide for themselves and their families, they will have a right to demand the appointment of a gnardian for their protuction. No other equality is implied it the Declaration of Independence, and uone other is demanded by the friends of emancipation.

Examined, then, from uny point of view which suggests itself to my mind, I am able to perceive no objection to the result which is contemplated with so much appareas alarm by Senators from States tolerating slavery. All declamation and argument designed to demonstrate the danger of a free negro poputation to the peace and quiet of a white communty is trimplantly refuted by the rapid iocrease of the buatital commercial metropolis of Maryland in population atirt trealth, atchough its streets swarm with free negroes anlag ise condition of thirty-six thousand free negroes of Bai thimsel a standing daily refutation of their alleged mabi, nerals hivide for themsolyes, and to become jeaceabie nd their If civilized society.
Tifyal fhmiliac to consider, in conclusion, the censore of the se prineide Senator from Pennsylvania. He inquired,
why
bit isten on these exciting subjects to the represein fom the border States; why do you not follow their advice, and thus steer clear of the quicksands and breakers that se $m$ to interrupt the progress of the ship of State? This implies tbat we do not meet here on terms of perfect equality as members of a deliberative body, is which each one can demand only a respectral hearing, and then an honest judgment of his peers based on the merits of the case. It implies a kind of superiority on the part of the Senators from slavo States to require a blind acquicscence in their views without considering their facts and weighing their reasons.
Now, sir, I protest agalnst such implication. A Senator who occupies a seat on this floor from a slave State has no right to demand a concurrence in his views; he has no right
to dictate the policy of the nation. All he has a right to require of this Senate is a respectfol, candid hearing, and then a candid, houest judgment. The Senate was not organized to record edlets ; it is supposed to be a deliberative body of peers. Senators are expected to listen patientiy and to carefully weigh all that can be said on all sides of every great national question, and then to express, in the form of laws, thefr solemn fodgment. It is as much the duty of the Senator from Kentucky to follow my advice as it is my duty to follow his. It miny be thought, however, that those who are surrounded by slavery ought to be better judges of the effects of legislation affecting the relation of master and slave, and of the legiflation calculated to advance the wellare of such commauitles. This should be admitted to be true in a qualifled sense; in discussing every locat question they have a right to extraordinary indulgence, just as every other Senator has when queations are pending of deep local interest to their immediate constituents. Bit, on the other hand, their statements, which are in the nature of evidence, must be received with many grains or allowance. Their testimony is not diginterested. Hey have a direct, certain interest in the subject of controveray. Thay are therefore to be heard as a witness who testifles for himself. Under the ordinary rules of judicial tribunals, they would not be permitted to testify in such a case; they would be excluded from the jury-box, and wonll not be permitted to auljulicate the catise. If, however, you admit their competence as witnesses, as jurors, and jutges, by what extraordinary rules of judicature do you claim that they shall be the only witnesses who shall be examined, the only jurors who shall be sworn, and the exclusive judges in their own case? This appears to me to be the very cifmax of presumption.

Sir, these Senators, instead of coming into this deifberative body with superior claims to consideration on the subject of slavery, come uader that class of disabilities which should require us to weigh with extraordinary care their argoments and their statements of facts; for when tried by our experience and observation of their prevlous counsel, we are not encouraged to rely on it impltcitly in the fitare. We have evidence that thoy are not infallible advisers, but are men of like passions and like weaknesses with ourselves. A majority of the Senaturs from what ar calied the border states have steadily opposed eyery meas ure alopted for the prosecution of this war for the suppression of the rebelifon. Had their advice been followed, the rebellion would have culminated long since in the inauguration of some one of the chief rebels as the President of the Republic, and we would have come to the end of our experiment of self-government. They have not given the slfghtest consideration to that overwhelming conviction of the public mind in the free States, that slavery is in a certain sense the cause of the war so ncedlessly commenced and waged against our nationality. They have steadlly and persistenily opposed every measure calculated in the most remote degree to affect its perpetnity, or to bring it under the restraints of law. The only fair interpretation of which their votes and, speeches are susceptible, with two or three honorable exceptions, is that slavery is the paramount institution in this country, for the protection of which the Constitntion was adopted, and without which the Constitution and Government are wurthless.
Sir, this is as we should expect, whon we reflect that nearly every Senat $r$ and Representative from the so-called border States are slaveholders themselves, and represent communities ruled and governed by slaveholders almost exclusively. The first incident calling my attention to this fact was the election of the one hundred members of the recent constitational convention in the State of Kentacky. These delegates represented, nominally, a community compozed of many hundreds of thousands of non-slaveholding whites, and a fow thousand slaveholders only, and yet every delegate was a slaveholder. The non-siavebolding interests werg without a representative. From my subsequent observation I am convinced that this is but an illus. tration of the general rue in slaveholding communities. Slaveholders hold uearly all the offices of honor and trust; they control society, and the locallegislation of the respective States, as absolutely as if non-slaveholders had no existence. They are completely ignored in every discussion. And until a very recent period the same impetuons policy controlled Congress. Aud even now Senators from slaves holding States imperionsly dema: d that their suggostionshall be bifadly adopted; and when, at the close of a discussion, they find themselves occasionally in the minority-that they have been treated only as peers, and not as superiors, some of them manifest a stolid indifference to the fate of the nation by absenting themselves from the Chamber for weeks
in succession, and others denounce the majority and predict the most dire consequences as the fruits of our stupidity. Nothing has been more persistontly asserted than the consolidation of the population of all the slave States in opposition to the Government of the United States if their sug gestions were not implicitly foliowed. And yet we have in no community rea!lzod any such result. The passage of every law on this subject, enacted during the present Congress, has in my opinion made us stronger in every bor der State.
The non-slaveholders of the border States cannot bave failed to perceice what is patent to the worid, that whatever remains of secession within their limits is lostered and cherished by slaveholders. This has been true since the commencement of the rebellon. Your policy and your arms have met with a stronger resistance from those in authority, chicfly slaveholders, than from any othor class of these communities. The Governors of all those States refused or declined to comply with the President's requisition for troons to defend the Union. The Governor of Kentucky and a lurge number of those at the head of pubiec amairs, are believed to bo stil uutrustworthy. This was true in Maryland. Athough the Governor stood firm in bis loyalty, your authorities were compelled to arrest, 1 believe, a ma jority of the members of her Lagislatare, to prevent that state from formally soceding from the Union, while I bave no doubt nifu-tenths of her people are loyat to the heart but the raling member8 ofsociety were distoyn siavehoiturs And this I believe to be true in every border State. Those from whom you have most to fear are those who have boon enjoying the patronage of the State and national Governments for ages. The most obtnse cannot fail to perceive thit alaveholders originated this rebellion, and aro now sustaining and cortroling it. How forlizh, then, for this Government 10 ignore another class or white peopie in the stare states. fi is my solomin conviction that their interests reguire the termination of slavery. It is my duty, there fore, as a Senator of tho Unitod Stites, in legislating for the nation, to consider their weftare as mach as the wulfare of their more wealthy slaveholding neighbors.
If the measures atopted by this Congress and the one now pending shomld dimition the power of the few who年e hitherto led socicty, the policy will increaso the powe of the masses; and I have not so poor an opinten of those who do not own slave property in the slave States, as to believe them incompetht to comprehead their own true interest. When you adopt a policy here for the wolfire o the whole nation, and especially for the welfare of the la boring classes, they wil oe no more stow to perceive their fre intorest than the poputaton in yoar State or mine. In my opinion, therefore, the adoption or these measures will give the Uuion inereased strength in the border States.
It has been sugcusted, however, I believe, by the senator from Peaasylyams, during tous declission, that the enizsment of negroes for companious in the ramks would discourage the enlistment of white men. The amondments now jending do unt contemplate stelian assoclation. The colorod mon and white men will be organizel into separate companies and regiments.
I do not, then, Mr. President, anticlpate any bad consequesces which can ligitimately flow from the passage of this bill or thio amendments proposod by my colleague. I think the legitmate effect will be to weakenslavery. Ihnve no doubt on this subject. I do not vote for this measure on that aceount; but I will not vote against the bill on that account. I will follow the policy which has beenzuggeslod, hot only by my political friends in fowa, but by my politucal oppozents. The Democrats of my State wrgo tho prosecution of this war for the supremacy of the laws, regardless of the consequences to slavery. They look on thit institution as in some way lying at the very fonadation of the rebellion, and they do not desire me to trent it with gloved hands, but to atopt whatever policy, so far as my hitmble nffuence will extond, may be calcmated to orusa out the rebellion and to secure the perpetuity of the Union, and if slavery should be swept by the board they will not be among the mourners at its fumeral.
I would not, if I know the convietions of my own heart, do an act that comes in conflict with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. I do not perceive bow, by any fur construction, under any knowa rale of interpretation, the passage of this bill can conflict with that insurument. The Senator from Illinois, [Jir. Browstyg,] for whose judicial opinions I have a vary profound respect, expressed the opinion, as I understood him, that the emancipation of the black recruit as a reward for faithful service in the armies of the country would conflict with the constitutional rights of his master; that black men might be
omployed in the military service, but that provisiou should be made for their restoration to their musters at the end of the war.
Mr. BRownING. What I said was, that in freeing the slave of a rebel master, whom we receive into onr service, that clothed us with no power to manumit his mother, wife and children, if they were the property of a loyal man That is what I said. I said nothing about an tmability to confer freedom upon the slaves of rebels whose services we accepted.

Mr. HARLAN. I did not, I think, misapprehend the Senator, but must have been very unfortunats in my statoment of my comprehension of his position. I do not, however, agcee with the Senator in the proposition whtch ho has just stated, that we are brund to iaquire whether the biack recruit has is loyal or a disloyal master. If he is a sound, heaithy man, capable of performing military duty, the Government is under no obligations to inquire whether he has or has not a master, or whether the master is loyal or a rebel. Whenever it becomes necessary for the defonce of the Government, you have a right to coerce the service of every able-bodied inhabitat, without referenco to his color or position in society. As I have asked on this floor before, what better is a megro than a white boy? Yuur son or mine may be takea as a voluateer or as a coukcript befor he is twenty one years of age, ard while ha owas his paxun the whoio of his sifvice. The Governmant does tot inguire Whether the father is loyal or disloyal ; the only questom propounded is, is the boy capable of performing the servic the Government nceds? If they find film plysicaliy and mentally compotent, they enroli him and pace him in the ranks, as I apprehond we have a right to do in relation to black men, without inquiring whother thoy aro slaves or freemen, whether thoir masters are loyat or disloyal ; and If we ascertain that any of then are siapes, and if in our opinion they would bccome, on accont of suich a provision, more valuable as soldfecs or as laborers, we may offer them the r freedom, and provile also for the freedom of their families, I will not onter into an examination of the question whether the loyal owaer may not demand and receive just compeasation for the services of such shares from the Governmeat. An livestigation of that question is not pertinent to the issue joinect. We propase to enitat thesse col bred men, and put them in tho trenches to dig dfichus and to erect fortifications, and when found necessary, and whon the parties are found compdtent, to arm them in the defeace of the coantry.

They are, then, if we act wisely, to be taken wherover they can be fonnd, whorever their sorvices ard needed without any inquiry as to the loyalty or disloyalty of thos who claim to be their owners. No slave-owhor cat hive a Btronger or higher ctaim to the services of his negro slay that I have to the services of my minor son. You dissegard ny clain ; you enlist him in tho service without con sulting me, and wiftheut inguiry into my loyally or disloy aity. The relation of master and slave is surely no more saered than that of parent and child. If you may coerco the service of the child, why not of the slive? Bat if you bave the constitutional right to tio so, has it zot hecome a solems duty, si ns to relleve our whit troopz, now so muoh prostrated by the hard labor and fattigue of camp life, in a climate to which they have not been accustomed? These troops are among our very best and most patriotife citizens. They are intolligent men. This know pgribetly that tho flecimation of their ranks by hard hator and wit in the ditches was unnecessary. They know tant they huve enlured alt this useless tof on account of ins kifitractandion of thoir comomaniting generals, in excluctiog if sir, ca. Itpos healthy men, aceltmated, eapatle of per drudgery and toil, without stphre dangor It appoars to them and to me of fir ther? lighor regatd for the wellare of nesropt masters than for thoir own troops $\mathrm{av}^{-1}$ dint home. This bill and pending amondminls secure a change of policy on this sulvect. onfaithinl representative of the brave vol atel our armies if I fifted to give it my esrbist sive onf ity need the assistance of these contrabmads to prewrye bif own heath and to save their lives, now impertod to sowuro the supremacy of the lawz, And they demand that we shall preserve the Union, and let slavery take care of itself, if it cin. If it should perish during the struggle for nationality, in the opinion of a large majority of them it will be a blessing to the country, and tend to promote the wolfare of tho human race.


[^0]:    "The monarchical governments of Europe and America, those that tolerate slavery, and those that do not, alike agree in employing negroes armed for the pablic defence. They ind that the burdens or war, and the sacrifice of life it oceasions, are too great to be borne by the white race alone. They call upon the colored races therefore to share in the

